



**SHREWSBURY PLANNING BOARD
SHREWSBURY, MASSACHUSETTS**

MINUTES

Regular Meeting: May 4, 2006 - 7:00 P.M.

Location: Selectmen's Hearing Room - Municipal Office Building

Present: Melvin P. Gordon, Chairman
Stephan M. Rodolakis, Vice-Chairman
Jill R. Myers Clerk
Kathleen M. Keohane
Donald F. Naber

Also Present: John D. Perreault, Town Engineer
Eric Denoncourt, Engineer/Planner

Mr. Gordon opened the meeting at 7:00 P.M.

1. Approved Minutes of April 6, 2006

The Planning Board approved the Minutes of April 6, 2006, as amended.

2. Signed bills.

3. Meetings and Hearings

7:00 P.M. Board Member Comments – no Board Member Comments

**7:05 P.M. Adams Farm Phase II, Senior Housing
Special Permit and Site Plan Approval
Public Hearing, Continued from October 6, 2005
Location: east side of Cherry Street, south of Boston Turnpike
Decision Deadline: 65 days from the close of hearing**

Attending the hearing were Kevin and Brendon Giblin – the developers; Charlie MacGregor – of Brendon Properties; Attorney Marshall Gould – representing the applicant; and James Tetreault – an engineer from Thompson-Liston Associates.

Mr. Tetreault listed the following changes:

- 1) at the request of the Conservation Commission, they moved Building #9 further away from the wetland area;
- 2) made a small change to the grading plan;
- 3) regarding sequencing, the detention basins will go in before site is totally cleared;
- 4) sewer route was redirected to go between buildings #3 and #4 out to pump station.

Ms. Keohane expressed concern that there wasn't more information on construction phasing and sequencing.

Mr. Giblin explained what he wants to do for sequencing, but said he wants to go to the Conservation Commission before he ties himself down with the Planning Board.

Mr. Gordon asked, in review, that they would be blasting in the middle of the site, clearing that, and then clearing the rest of the site, so the site will be totally cleared? Mr. Tetreault said it wouldn't be entirely cleared and showed what they would be proposing to the Conservation Commission for erosion controls. Mr. Giblin said they intend to use the floc-lock system out there, as they did in Adams Farm I.

Mr. Rodolakis expressed concern about getting the site balanced. After much discussion, Mr. Giblin stated there is no rush for this project like the first one, so this site work can be done next summer in the drier months.

Mr. Gordon listed the following:

- 1) will there be a sidewalk on the main road? Mr. Tetreault said they are not, because they don't want to encourage pedestrian traffic and they want to limit disturbance to wetland;
- 2) asked about using a Cape Cod Berm; Mr. Tetreault said they want to use it for the aesthetic look and noted that they will be maintaining it, not the Town;
- 3) asked about roof drains? Mr. Tetreault showed locations of roof drains;
- 4) asked if they considered possibility of moving building #4 and #5 slightly, thinking they could then change shape of detention basin so building #3 stairs aren't going into the detention basin; and there was discussion about this;
- 5) asked when buildings #2, #3, and #4 were being built? Mr. Tetreault said buildings #3 and #9 would be built later because the basins collecting water on the site during construction are located in these areas;
- 6) asked grades of road; and Mr. Tetreault reviewed;
- 7) asked about the emergency access drive; Mr. Tetreault said it would be 15 feet wide, with grade of 4%, and said it will be labeled and signed as emergency;
- 8) asked if driveway was different for building #9 and Mr. Tetreault said it was moved slightly.

Mr. Denoncourt asked about the construction sequence. Mr. Tetreault said no building will be built until blasting was done, utilities were in, the road was in, and stabilized. Mr. Denoncourt asked if those areas of the buildings would be disturbed in any way during initial sitework? Mr. Tetreault said most of it will be.

Mr. Gordon stated that the mitigation letter will be part of the record.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to June 8, 2006, at 7:10 P.M.

**7:10 P.M. Kings Brook Crossing, Definitive Subdivision
Public Hearing, Continued from December 8, 2005
Location: Old Mill Road, northwest of Harrington Avenue
Decision Deadline: June 15, 2006**

Attending the hearing was Mike and Jessica Venincasa – the developers; Attorney Joe Allen – representing the developers; and an engineer from Protec Engineering.

Attorney Allen reviewed some of the changes:

- 1) reconfigured Lots #4 & #7;
- 2) settled driveways with abutters

The engineer from Protec Engineering reviewed some other changes. Attorney Allen said Mr. Venincasa has been in contact with Parks and Rec. Department for something they might do there.

Mr. Naber asked about the latest revised plans; Mr. Denoncourt explained that new plans got delivered to Engineering one day he was out; the revised plans went to Conservation Commission and to him, but when he returned he didn't realize they were revised plans.

Mr. Gordon suggested considering purchasing a house next to the project, which is currently for sale, thinking it might help sitework.

Mr. Gordon asked when Lot #7 is sold, there will be an easement on top of the driveways? Attorney Allen said, "yes."

Mr. Gordon asked about the driveway waivers on Lots #1 and #30 and asked why? Mr. Venincasa said it's for design purposes of the houses.

Mr. Denoncourt said he was looking for calculations for the detention pond design.

A letter was submitted to Mr. Denoncourt from Tim McGuire, of McGuire Engineering, confirming that the current detention pond design is consistent with the drainage calculations dated September 29, 2005.

Debra Kelley, 126A Old Mill Road, expressed concern for further division of the lot. Mr. Gordon said they cannot divide the lot any further without coming back to the Planning Board.

Larry Barton, 35 Greylock Avenue, asked about the length of the road; he said he continues his objection of the 5-foot strip along side of the road, expressing concern about who was going to maintain it.

There was further discussion about the strip, and basically the Board stated that if there are thoughts of purchasing the Barter property and building the strip, it should be done now. Attorney Allen said there is no interest in doing this.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to June 8, 2006, at 7:15 P.M.

**7:15 P.M. Gulf View Estates, Definitive Subdivision
Public Hearing, Continued from December 8, 2005
Location: Gulf Street & Browning Road
Decision Deadline: July 19, 2006**

Mr. Gordon read a letter from Attorney Allen, dated May 4, 2006, asking for a continuance, and granting an extension for decision deadline to July 19, 2006.

The Board voted to approve the continuance. Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to June 8, 2006, at 7:05 P.M.

**7:20 P.M. Nelson Point, Definitive Subdivision
Public Hearing, Continued from December 8, 2005
Location: off Nelson Point Road, west of Lake Street
Decision Deadline: June 15, 2006**

Attending the hearing were Attorney David Brown and Chris Cutler – the developers, and John Bensley – the engineer from Beals and Thomas, Inc.

Mr. Gordon noted the following letters:

- 1) From Secretary of Environmental Affairs dated April 7, 2006
- 2) From Taylor Abstract Company dated April 7, 2006
- 3) From Attorney David Brown dated May 2, 2006, to contribute sum of money to Parks and Recreation Department.

Mr. Bensley reviewed his letter submitted to the Board, dated April 20, 2006, regarding the waiver request of 2.9%. Mr. Dencourt said this has been reviewed by himself and the Town Engineer and they don't see a problem with it.

Mr. Gordon officially closed the hearing.

**7:35 P.M. Dunkin Donuts Drive Through, Site Plan Approval
Public Hearing
Location: 32 – 36 Maple Avenue
Decision Deadline: 65 days from the close of hearing**

Attending the hearing was George Cadette – the developer, Attorney Kevin Byrne – representing George Cadette, and Patrick Healy – an engineer from Thompson & Liston.

Mr. Gordon noted receipt of the following letters:

- 1) From William Yeomans, 51 Grafton Street, dated April 26, 2006;
- 2) From Thomas C. Rogers, Thomas E. Sears Insurance Agency, 26 Maple Avenue, dated September 19, 2005

Attorney Byrne commented that he felt that with the drive-thru, Sears Insurance should see less parking problems in his lot.

Mr. Healy gave a quick overview for the change of the drive-thru:

- 1) moved fence;
- 2) moving some plants;
- 3) proposing to extend fence out to Maple Avenue – build 4-foot fence from stockade fence.

Mr. Healy said he can address Engineering comments.

There was discussion of wording on sign for abutting property and as to whether it was within Planning Board's jurisdiction.

There was discussion as to the height of the fence.

Mr. Gordon listed the following:

- 1) asked the length of the parking spaces; Mr. Healy said 19-feet;
- 2) asked if there was overhang at berm;
- 3)
- 4) asked if Wellness is being notified that fence is going in back on their property?
Attorney Byrne said no, not at this time.

Attorney Robert Williamson, from Fletcher, Tilton, and Whipple, representing Sears Insurance, expressed concern for the parking on the Sears property; and expressed concern that the site will increase in volume; and noted that they object to any increase in volume.

Mr. Denoncourt responded by explaining the vehicle capacity on site. Mr. Healy said they still have the traffic study from when the drive-thru was first proposed.

Mr. Gordon asked if Sears has considered changing their parking area to try and help alleviate the parking problem. Attorney Williamson said, "No," and stated he didn't feel they should have to.

Mr. Rogers said he still feels the fence should go to the road with signage.

Attorney Robert Stiles, 15 Westmont Circle, listed the following:

- 1) asked if a fence was considered on White Hen side to lower noise;
- 2) asked if there was volume control on the ordering box.

Mr. Gordon said there is a State standard for volume control.

Mr. Cadette said White Hen is responsible for that side for aesthetics and control.

The Board voted to close the hearing. Mr. Gordon officially closed the hearing. The Planning Board voted to approve the site plan for Dunkin Donuts, subject to a written decision.

**7:50 P.M. Dunkin Donuts & Retail Building, Site Plan Approval
Public Hearing
Location: 870 Hartford Turnpike (Route 20)
Decision Deadline: 65 days from the close of hearing**

Attending the hearing was Bob Moss – the property owner; George Cadette – the builder; Attorney Kevin Byrne – representing George Cadette; and Patrick Healy – an engineer from Thompson-Liston Associates, Inc.

Mr. Healy did site review and revisions. He said this is for a Dunkin' Donuts only – there will be no Baskin Robbins, and said they will be going to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

- 1) submitted drainage calcs;
- 2) submitted traffic impact analysis, which was modified from one previously submitted;
- 3) modification of Dunkin' Donuts plan.

Mr. Gordon asked about sidewalks. Mr. Moss said he didn't plan for sidewalks east or west bound; stating concern for pedestrian safety in that area.

Mr. Healy reviewed and responded to Mr. Denoncourt's comment letter.

Mr. Rodolakis asked about any issues with two buildings on one lot. Attorney Byrne said in the decision with the ZBA, there is no problem. Mr. Healy said the lot could be divided.

Ms. Keohane listed the following:

- 1) asked about location of the loading zone; Mr. Healy said loading would not be during peak time;
- 2) concern about angle of first space – is it clear of drive-thru? Mr. Healy said it was;
- 3) asked if the Northern Bayberry was okay to use – is it invasive? Mr. Healy said he will check.

Mr. Gordon listed the following:

- 1) asked about waivers; Mr. Healy said there were none;
- 2) Bituminous Concrete? Mr. Moss said it will be ground on site or recycled back to asphalt plant;
- 3) Is parking plan for other tenant building worse case scenario? Mr. Moss said the site is set up for a certain type of tenants;
- 4) traffic flow on Dunkin' Donuts site?; Mr. Healy said one way;
- 5) asked if dumpster area is enough for Dunkin' Donuts site; and Mr. Cadette said yes it was.
- 6) then asked if dumpster area was enough for building with six tenants? Mr. Moss said yes
- 7) asked if the building would be sprinklered? Mr. Moss said it would be done if needed.
- 8) asked about use of grease traps; Mr. Cadette said they will be used under the sink(s).

Mara Lindstrom, 824 Hartford Turnpike, the owner of the property at 820 Hartford Turnpike, between Saulenas and Nations Rent listed the following:

- 1) expressed concern that a merge lane will reduce her frontage;
- 2) expressed concern of drainage and water going into her property;
- 3) expressed concern of being able to put a building on her property, as the previous owner was rejected by the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to June 8, 2006, at 7:20 P.M.

4. New Business

a. 7 Sunflower Circle, Driveway Construction

Mr. Denoncourt said after many years of debate and negotiations between homeowner and developer, the driveway is now going to be done, and explained the status. The Board voted to allow Engineering to take appropriate action to resolve the issue.

b. Bond Reduction for Highland Hill Estates Subdivision

Mr. Rodolakis abstained from the discussion and vote, due to possible conflict of interest. The Board voted to approve the bond reduction for Highland Hill Estates.

c. Bond Reduction for Stonybrook Farm II Subdivision

Mr. Denoncourt reviewed a couple of issues:

- 1) replication still being worked on – hasn't fully taken;
- 2) issue of guardrail

The Board voted to sign the bond reduction for Stonybrook Farm II and hold it in Engineering until issues are resolved.

d. Approve Bond Amount for Summit Ridge Estates

The Board voted to approve the bond amount as suggested by Engineering, for Summit Ridge Estates.

5. Old Business

a. Discussed and Signed Decision for 101 North Quinsigamond Avenue

The Board voted to approve and sign the Decision, as written, for 101 North Quinsigamond Avenue.

b. Discussed and Signed Decision for Palm Meadow Estates

The Board voted to approve and sign the Decision, as written, for Palm Meadow Estates. The Board also voted to authorize Mr. Gordon to sign the letter from Mr. Russell noting their monetary donation to the Town Parks and Rec. Dept.

c. Discussed Conditions for Residences at Flint Pond Decision

The Board discussed the conditions for the Decision for Residences at Flint Pond; agreeing Mr. Denoncourt can draft the agenda for their review.

5. Old Business (Cont'd)

d. Signed Recommendation Letters for Annual Town Meeting

The Board voted to authorize Mr. Gordon to sign the recommendation letter for Annual Town Meeting.

6. Correspondence

- a) Noted Planning Board Filing Fees collected in 2005
- b) Noted Letter to William Harper, from Jack Perreault, regarding High Street Improvements
- c) Noted Letter to residents on High Street, from Jack Perreault, regarding Sidewalk Construction on High Street
- d) Noted Letter to Rose Marie Levesque and Katherine Wellington, from Michael Hale, regarding Petition for Zone Change.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Annette W. Rebovich